

REMARKS

In this Response, Applicant cancels claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-13, 15, 39, 42, 46-48, 50-54, 58-64, 69, 70, and 72-77, without prejudice, amends claims 4, 6, 8, 14, 16, 17, 20-34, 36-38, 40, 41, 43-45, 49, 55-57, 65-68, and 71, adds new claims 78-93, and traverses the Examiner's rejections. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the application. Cancellations of and amendments to the claims should not be interpreted as acquiescence to any of the Examiner's rejections. Rather, cancellations of and amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the present application. Silence with regard to any of the Examiner's rejections should not be construed as acquiescence to any of the rejections. Specifically, silence with regard to any of the rejections of the dependent claims that depend from an independent claim considered by the Applicant to be allowable based on the Amendments and/or Remarks provided herein should not be construed as acquiescence to any of the rejections. Rather, silence should be construed as recognition by the Applicant that the previously lodged rejections are moot based on the Amendments and/or Remarks submitted by the Applicant relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Applicant reserves the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or a subsequent application. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 4, 6, 8, 14, 16-38, 40, 41, 43-45, 49, 55-57, 65-68, 71, and 78-93 are pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over one or more of Appelt, Bowen, Livowsky, and Whittaker.

Independent Claim 14

Applicant's independent claim 14 is directed to a method for searching first and second data sources having respective first and second data formats, i.e., different data formats. Among other things, Applicant's independent claim 14 includes receiving a query, *generating first and second customized queries based on the query and the respective first and second data formats*, and applying the first and second customized queries to the respective first and second data sources.

In contrast to Applicant's independent claim 14, none of the cited references generates, based on a single query, customized queries for data sources that store data *in different formats*.

FHBoston/1006119.2

Rather, each of the cited references generates a customized query for a single database that stores data in a single data format. For example, Appelt and Livowsky describe systems that can convert a natural language query into a query for a database that stores data in a single data format, Bowen describes a system that can convert a keyword query into a query for a database that stores data in a single data format, and Whittaker describes a system that can convert a menu-driven query, a keyword query, and/or a natural-language query into a query for a database that stores data in a single data format. As such, none of the cited references teaches or suggests the feature of Applicant's independent claim 14 directed to *generating first and second customized queries based on the query and the respective first and second data formats*.

Since none of the cited references teaches or suggests the feature of Applicant's independent claim 14 directed to *generating first and second customized queries based on the query and the respective first and second data formats*, none of the cited references can teach or suggest the features of Applicant's independent claim 14 directed to *applying the first and second customized queries*.

In summary, none of the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of Applicant's independent claim 14 directed to *generating first and second customized queries based on the query and the respective first and second data formats and applying the first and second customized queries to the respective first and second data sources*.

Applicant thus traverses the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 14, and Applicant considers independent claim 14 to be allowable. Since claims 4, 6, 8, 16-38, 40, 41, and 43-45 depend from independent claim 14, Applicant also considers claims 4, 6, 8, 16-38, 40, 41, and 43-45 to be allowable as depending on an allowable base claim, thereby traversing the Examiner's rejections of such claims. As such, Applicant's failure to specifically respond to the Examiner's rejections of claims 4, 6, 8, 16-38, 40, 41, and 43-45 does not provide, and should not be construed as, an acquiescence to the Examiner's rejections of such claims.

Independent Claims 55 and 65

Independent claims 55 and 65 include features similar to independent claim 14. As previously provided herein, Applicant considers independent claim 14 to be allowable for the reasons previously stated, which are equally applicable to independent claims 55 and 65. Since independent claim 14 is allowable, independent claims 55 and 65 and claims 49, 56, 57, 66-68,

and 71 depending therefrom are also allowable, thereby traversing the Examiner's rejections of such claims. As such, Applicant's failure to specifically respond to the Examiner's rejections of claims 49, 56, 57, 66-68, and 71 does not provide, and should not be construed as, an acquiescence to the Examiner's rejections of such claims.

Based on the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New Claims

Applicant adds new claims 78-93 directed to features of the present application. New claims 78-81, 82-87, and 88-93 depend from independent claims 14, 55, and 65, respectively.

As previously provided herein, Applicant considers independent claims 14, 55, and 65 to be allowable. Since independent claims 14, 55, and 65 are allowable, Applicant also considers new claims 78-93 depending therefrom to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant considers this Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action.

Based on the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests allowance. Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
FOLEY HOAG LLP

Date:

January 29, 2004

Customer No. 25,181
Patent Group
Foley Hoag LLP
155 Seaport Blvd.
Boston, MA 02210
Tel: (617) 832-1241
Fax: (617) 832-7000

Kevin A. Oliver

Kevin A. Oliver
Reg. No. 42,049
Attorney for the Applicant